

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 11, 2006. Claims 1 to 30 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 10, 16 and 25 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In that Office Action, Claims 1 to 30 were provisionally rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of copending Application No. 10/616,811 (Mkrtchyan 1) and Application No. 10/950,281 (Mkrtchyan 2).

Applicants note that a provisional double patenting rejection between patent applications should be withdrawn in the earlier-filed application if the provisional double patenting rejection is the only rejection remaining in the earlier-filed application. See MPEP § 804(I)(B). Applicants submit that the present application was filed before either Mkrtchyan 1 or Mkrtchyan 2 and that the provisional double patenting rejections are the only remaining issues in the present application.

Furthermore, Applicants have maintained a clear demarcation among the claims of the present application, Mkrtchyan 1 and Mkrtchyan 2. The claims in the present application are directed to the printing and verification of a voucher. The pending claims of Mkrtchyan 1 are directed to features of a gaming machine printer that include a coiled electrical cable, adjusting power supplied to a thermal print mechanism, establishing a communication session or port, storing a status of the gaming machine printer in a nonvolatile memory, a voucher path management system, and a plurality of communication ports. The pending claims of Mkrtchyan 2 are directed to features of a gaming machine

printer that include a burster bar, an electrostatic discharge device and a voucher management system. Therefore, the claims of the present application, Mkrtchyan 1 and Mkrtchyan 2 are clearly different.

As the provisional double patenting rejection is the only rejection remaining in the present application and there is a clear demarcation among the claims of the present application, Mkrtchyan 1 and Mkrtchyan 2, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Frank L. Cire', written over a horizontal line.

Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,419

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 113859v1